

Lewis County Planning Commission **Workshop**

Lewis County Courthouse
Commissioners' Hearing Room – 2nd Floor
351 NW North St – Chehalis, WA

October 27, 2015 - Meeting Notes

Planning Commissioners Present: Mike Mahoney, District 1; Russ Prior, District 3; Jeff Millman, District 2; Sue Rosbach, District 1; Bob Guenther, District 3

Planning Commissioners Excused: Richard Tausch, District 2; Leslie Myers, District 1

Staff Present: Lee Napier, Eric Eisenberg, Fred Evander, Bill Tietzel, Pat Anderson

Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes
- Memo from Eric Eisenberg re: Proposed zoning changes for animal kennels, hospitals, shelters and boarding facilities
- Staff Report re: Potential code amendments and process to change code and comprehensive plan
- Proposed code amendments

1. Call to Order

Chairman Mahoney called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. The Commissioners introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Agenda

There were no changes to the agenda.

3. Approval of Meeting Notes from October 13, 2015

Chair Mahoney stated that edited meeting notes were received just prior to tonight's meeting and asked for a motion to table approval until the meeting on November 10. The motion was made by Commissioner Guenther; seconded by Commissioner Prior and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Prior stated the meeting notes reminded him that in the new Shoreline rules the reasonable use codes have been eliminated. For the record, Commissioner Prior is against that. He believes the existing reasonable use code is very useful.

4. Old Business

There was no old business.

5. New Business

- A. Workshop on Proposed Code Change regarding Kennels, etc.

Eric Eisenberg, Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, stated he has been working with staff of Community Development and Public Health to look at how the County handles animal kennels. There is an existing chapter that regulates the practices of kennels, which is Lewis County Code chapter 6.15. That code is going to mostly remain unchanged. The Public Health staff has no complaint with the code for the most part; they have a complaint about the lack of information allowing them to use that code. There is a proposal that has been discussed before the BOCC in a preliminary meeting which is going to be moving towards a public hearing sometime soon with input from stakeholders to develop an operating permit program in order to run an animal kennel for dogs. The major purpose of this program is to allow the County to do a one-time inspection of someone's kennel as part of their yearly operating permit to see how they are complying with the existing code that governs the operation of that type of business.

In reviewing that code and developing the operating permit program, Community Development staff noticed that the zoning code as it stands does not make a lot of sense regarding animal kennels. Lewis County has many facilities that hold large numbers of dogs. Some of those are commercial kennels where dogs are bred for sale; there are also animal rescue facilities where abandoned dogs are kept on a farm in enclosures. These are non-commercial establishments. Most of all of these facilities are in Rural Density Development (RDD) zones. The existing zoning code uses in the Local Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRDs) table uses the term "animal kennels" and makes them special use permits in certain zones and does not permit them in others. In the RDD table it treats "animal hospitals and boarding facilities" as being permitted in all RDD zones and makes no mention of kennels. One might conclude that these terms are being used interchangeably. But, it poses a legal problem, in that legally if different terms are used in different locations it is presumed they have different meanings. The fact that kennels were intentionally omitted from one table and included in another makes it seem like kennels were intentionally being disallowed in one location while disallowing animal hospitals in another, which is not what the code meant to do.

Since the kennel process is being reviewed anyway, it seemed like a good time to clarify the intention of the code all along, which is that animal kennels, hospitals, shelters and boarding facilities would all be treated equivalently and that they would be permitted in those places where people are allowed to have businesses of that type, such as a farm.

Staff has prepared for the Planning Commission the proposed change that would treat all of these types of dog holding facilities to be the same type of use and that it would permit them in the RDD zones and permit them in many, but not all, of the LAMIRDS, and have a slightly bigger review in areas where they might be in cities or Small Town Mixed Use (STMU).

Mr. Eisenberg asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Chair Mahoney asked if these facilities, other than veterinary hospitals, are required to be licensed today. Mr. Eisenberg stated there is a federal licensing program that governs facilities that breed dogs for medical or other research, or for sale to certain types of pet stores; however, there is a large exception: it is run by the federal government and it only applies when the government decides that the operation is above a certain minimal standard. Most of the people in Lewis County who do not sell to university medical facilities or pet stores fall outside of the federal licensing program. There is no other license required in this county. In other counties many of these types of facilities do have to have a license. Lewis County started looking at an operating permit program because it was noticed that other counties had done so and people seemed to be moving to our county to avoid being regulated. That

made Lewis County a desirable place to be if the facility was not very nice, which is not humane and not good for public health.

Chairman Mahoney asked why there would be a differentiation between a dog kennel, aviary, cattery, stable, or any confined animal facility. Mr. Eisenberg stated two reasons: First, there is already an existing code that governs how dog breeding should be done and there is the lack of ability to enforce the existing laws. This change is a tool to allow the County to enforce existing law as opposed to taking a new step. There are similar problems from cat breeding facilities, but the problem of cat breeding facilities is more difficult and problems are posed outside of the scope or are of different character from dog-breeding facilities. For example, it's not unusual for a person to own 20 cats. The County had a difficult time trying to distinguish someone like that from a rescue owner who had many cats. That would be a more difficult regulatory problem and staff decided to take a small government approach and stick with existing code.

Also, there is a practice of breeding dogs for sale and then selling the puppies in a parking lot or other informal places, on line, etc. It is less common for cats to be sold that way, so there was a greater demand for dog breeders – this seems to be an acceptable way to buy a dog. That may have been a reason for creating a dog breeding practices code.

Commissioner Guenther asked how many kennels are in Lewis County and will Mr. Teitzel's department inspect them. Mr. Eisenberg stated there is an animal official and she is already tasked with working with the animal shelter and trying to make sure people comply with the existing animal code. She would be the person doing the inspections since she is already doing that; however she does it on a voluntary basis when people permit her to enter to inspect. The problem with that is if the person is told they are not doing something correctly they may not allow her to inspect again. Then the law is the least enforced against the people it ought to be reaching.

In terms of the number of kennels, there are about 20-30 facilities that would be regulated by the County.

Commissioner Prior stated the memo mentions dogs but the table says animal shelters, not dog shelters. He did not assume the discussion was about dogs only. Mr. Eisenberg stated for purposes of providing the background that the operating permit program is in the works, and how it was discovered, it applies only to dogs. The zoning code change does not apply only to dogs because the zoning code already uses the term "animal kennels, shelter, hospital and boarding facility." It appears that the code was already contemplating that these rules might apply more generally.

Commissioner Prior stated the driving force behind these changes is catching the bad operators and the inhumane treatment. He would not like to see somebody slip through the cracks that is a viable owner of an existing facility but is all of sudden zoned out. Is there a way to find out if this would affect a viable owner? It would occur in STMU or a rural residential and a shorelines area.

Mr. Evander stated if it is an existing use within those zones it would be treated as a nonconforming use. Having said that, currently this zoning table does not allow animal kennels in those two zones. Those are primarily residential areas. He emphasized that the top matrix on the staff report would make it more flexible for people to be permitted for an animal kennel, shelter, etc. Currently all of those places where the 'A' and 'P' are shown are special use permits which means notice to neighbors would be

required as well as a hearing before the hearing examiner to get a permit to operate these facilities. As proposed these would be going to an administrative approval which does not require a hearing in front of a hearing examiner unless neighbors request it. The 'P' would be permitted outright. Staff felt it was more appropriate to regulate the public health aspect through the operational program rather than a permit when someone comes in to do an application.

Commissioner Prior stated the driving force is the humane treatment of animals. He does not want someone who has a viable facility to be zoned out.

Mr. Eisenberg stated when this issue was first encountered he understood that Ms. Hornburg (the animal officer) to say that all of the facilities that she thinks would be affected are already in RDD zones; she does not think any of them are in a LAMIRD. Since the change is proposing permits for all RDD zones that would mean they would all be safe. Commissioner Prior stated if that is the case then that's good, but he does not know that that is the case. He was asking if someone can find out if that is the case. Mr. Eisenberg stated that could be done.

Mr. Evander stated that it would be treated as a non-conforming use. Someone would not be kicked out of their facility by changing this code. When we change code, typically anything that is out there that is affected by that change is considered a non-conforming use.

Commissioner Rosbach stated all of these facilities have to go through a permit process and then there is public input. Can a neighbor complain and put an existing facility out of business?

Mr. Eisenberg stated not from an existing zoning perspective. To clarify, if the existing zoning is compared with what is being proposed, in every category any place where we have liberalized the zoning in some fashion, it was either not permitted and now it is permitted or it was previously allowed only by a special use permit and now it is outright permitted or allowed under a lesser standard than special use. There is no person in any zone who would find himself in a more protective zoning now than before. Many of the facilities were operating illegally which is not what was intended when the code was written so this is designed to clarify that yes, it is legal to be there.

The other question was: what happens if a neighbor complains? For those facilities that were in a special use permit area, if at the time of the special use permit hearing the neighbors were complaining and the hearing examiner decided to deny a permit, then a neighbor could have prevented the facility. Today the only time that would occur is in the few areas where there is an administrative review in which the neighbors might allow a hearing to occur. Currently no existing person would find themselves in that position because they already obtained a special use permit. Under the operating permit program, which is run by Environmental Health and enforced through Code Enforcement, they would go out to investigate violations of the code because someone has made a complaint. A neighbor who sees someone running a dog breeding facility or kennel and thinks it is being done in a way that is illegal might complain and that might cause someone to go out to investigate. That can already happen because the rules governing dog kennels already exist and those aren't being changed that much.

Commissioner Millman asked how many dogs make a kennel. Mr. Eisenberg stated the kennel provision is quite broad and that has not been changed. It defines a kennel as any facility in which dogs are bred for sale or barter and any place where ten or more dogs are kept on the same property. That definition makes lots of things a kennel but that does not subject them to the bigger or more complicated

requirements regarding kennels unless they keep those dogs in what are called primary enclosures; in other words, if they keep them in cages or rooms of their own. At that time there are rules as to how often they are given food and water, etc. If you happen to own 12 dogs you might count as a kennel but you would not be subject to some of the more difficult requirements. When the number of dogs are counted those only include dogs that are “intact” meaning dogs not neutered or spayed above the age of 6 months.

Chair Mahoney stated since there is a change to the zoning regulations that the last half of the second page [of the memo] is what the Planning Commission is looking at. The changes detailed on the front is not being discussed – access to inspection, etc. Mr. Eisenberg stated that was correct. It would be nice if the Planning Commission’s recommendation regarding the zoning changes was something that the BOCC could be considering at the same time that it considers the others. It is a two-handed statement clarifying that someone can operate a kennel in Lewis County but that the County also wants those kennels run humanely.

Chair Mahoney stated the Planning Commission would be holding a public hearing on this matter and suggested rolling all animal breeding into agriculture which would take care of the problem. Agriculture is already allowed in all of these areas.

B. Workshop – Proposed Code Change Amending Process to Change Code and Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Evander stated currently the Lewis County Code has two ways to amend the Comprehensive Plan and it has two ways to provide public notice when the Comp Plan will be amended. Those sections don’t necessarily work together but ideally it would be better to have one statement of how to amend the Comp Plan.

Because the economy is picking up people are calling asking about zoning changes. In looking at the code, Mr. Evander found no process to amend the zoning map. A few years ago the Planning Commission changed how the zoning map and future land use map worked together. The idea behind that made a lot of sense because the future land use map and the Comprehensive Plan can only be amended once a year. It used to be that the zoning map was exactly the same as the future land use map. As a result, the zoning map could only be changed once a year. What the Planning Commission recommended, and what the BOCC adopted, was creating a more general future land use map and a zoning map that was more specific that could be amended any time. In doing that a process was not created to take advantage of amending the zoning map at any time. Those are the issues that are driving this: 1) create a way to amend the zoning map; 2) clean up how the Comp Plan is actually amended.

Mr. Evander stated section 1 is one of the two ways that details how to notice a Comprehensive Plan. On page 2 section (c) is struck out. Staff wanted to clarify a couple of things. When we provide notice on a site the building inspectors post the site. This code (section (b)) makes it sound like an applicant has to paint a 4 x 8 foot wooden sign to notice the property. The County does not want to make an applicant do that so those two provisions have also been crossed out and it is proposed to refer to the RCW.

Another change being proposed in (a) and (b) on page 1 is that staff thinks it makes sense going from 30 days required notice to 14 days required notice. 14 days is the minimum time allowed in State law and that is what staff is recommending.

Commissioner Prior stated the first sentence in 17.05.100 (2)(b) is the same as (2)(a) and he thought it was a typo. He thought it should be for Master Plan proceedings. Mr. Evander stated that is correct. Also, in the second to the last sentence in (b) using the word "issues" is confusing. He suggested using "is issued."

Commissioner Prior stated the way code is written now is the only public notice that is required is the sign. There is nothing that requires any publication in a newspaper. Mr. Evander stated he thought that was in a different section of code. It is not intended to be eliminated. It is in 17.170. As for the special use and master plan proceedings, he is certain that will be in the actual special use and master plan sections of the code. Mr. Evander would really like to overhaul the entire code but that would be a very major project. What he is going for is discreet chunks to make things better without doing the entire code.

Mr. Evander stated section 2 is entirely crossed out. 17.12 will be moved because when amendments are being discussed it is better to have all of the amendment sections in the same place: code amendments, 17.165, and then Comprehensive Plan amendments, 17.170. This section is cut and pasted to 17.170.

Section 3 is provisions to get to the zoning code changes. If someone wants to amend a zoning map this is how it would be done in 17.165. It would require a public hearing before the hearing examiner and ultimate adoption by the BOCC. It will be treated more like a development application because it is a quasi-judicial action rather than a legislative action. There are specific criteria for rezones, under (5) on page 7, and the findings that the hearing examiner would need to make are included.

Commissioner Prior stated in number 165.10 (4) there is a description of 50% of the owners in an area. He assumes this is talking about one parcel, one owner. Are you talking about the number of owners regardless of the amount of acreage? He thought that someone who owns more acreage should have more voting power. Mr. Evander stated that was one of his comments on the side. Should it be based on land value or acreage? Commissioner Prior thought acreage was simpler. These are only Commissioner Prior's ideas and they makes sense to him. Mr. Evander stated it makes sense to him, also. He put assessed value because that is what is done with annexations, which are based on assessed value. Either assessed value or acreage would be okay with Mr. Evander.

Commissioner Prior stated Mr. Evander struck out section 17.165.020, page 8. The following section needs to be .020, not .030.

Ms. Napier, Director of Community Development, stated the comments being brought up are good comments. This is a workshop and the Planning Commissioners are reading what is being presented by staff and giving feedback and asking questions. Staff will process that input and bring it back. She asked that no one ever feel like he or she should not be offering comments.

Commissioner Prior stated for site specific amendments the Planning Commission will no longer be involved. All of the wording has been struck, including participation by the Planning Commission. We

have been involved in site specific rezones. He thought that the Planning Commission should remain involved. An example is the rezoning for the gravel mine on the Cowlitz River.

Chairman Mahoney stated the discussion was about initiating a procedure. He thought that anyone should be able to come forward and request a change regardless of what the neighbors think. That doesn't mean they will get it. The good thing about it coming before the Planning Commission is now the neighbors with the predominant acreage can have their say and the Planning Commission makes a recommendation based on what it thinks is best for the County and that area. Anyone should be able to come forward to ask for something, and have a process for determining whether or not that request should be granted.

Commissioner Prior agreed. If you are a single parcel land owner and you want to change your zone you should be able to request that. The process takes it to the next level and involves the neighbor.

Mr. Evander stated many Planning Commissions have two roles. There is the quasi-judicial function which means they are sitting as judges. They are hearing land use applications, such as sub-divisions and special use permits. The legislative function is when the Planning Commission is crafting law. The reason Mr. Evander put this to the hearing examiner is because in Lewis County one of those functions is largely served by the hearing examiner. He or she serves most quasi-judicial land use applications. Mr. Evander could not think of a situation where the Planning Commissioners would be sitting as judges.

Commissioner Guenther stated if you look at the fact that the Planning Commission has reviewed most of these items it gives the Commissioners a chance to get more information and it is helpful if the Planning Commission can discuss the issues prior to the hearing examiner and the BOCC. Chair Mahoney stated every year the Planning Commission reviews the recommendations for Open Space applications and relief from taxing. Those are site specific. The Planning Commission looked at the issue in Mineral and the gravel mine. Reviewing and making recommendations for changes to zoning and the Comp Plan is what the Planning Commission does.

Commissioner Prior stated that when someone is required to go to a hearing examiner a higher bar is being set than when someone is required to go to the Planning Commission. The hearing examiner makes his decision and the BOCC votes on what he says. Commissioner Prior thinks that is a higher bar for an individual land owner. Mr. Evander did not think so. It is the same criteria that applies regardless.

Chairman Mahoney stated the hearing examiner acts almost as a judge, making a ruling of law that can be appealed. Mr. Evander stated so does the Planning Commission. Commissioner Prior stated some of the Planning Commission decisions are kicked up to the hearing examiner. Section .165 can be crafted in such a way that it says nothing about noticing. The notice requirements can still be separated from the pathway requirements. Mr. Evander stated it would be easy enough to change the text from hearing examiner to Planning Commission. Chairman Mahoney thought any zoning changes should start with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Evander stated 17.112 has been put into 17.170. There are just a couple of underlines in this section. Originally .112 was meeting the requirement of the Growth Management Act (GMA), and that is the reason for the language "public participation program." The title has been changed to Legislative Amendments and 17.170.10 has been changed to replace the public participation chapter. On page 12

the notice of public hearings is in section (d) where it talks about publishing in the newspaper. The other places are listed where the meetings will be noticed: the Timberland Libraries and Senior Centers. In section (3), rather than specifying how the BOCC reviews the legislative amendments, staff suggests that the BOCC can review it in accordance with their procedures.

Commissioner Prior was confused by section .010, the purpose under RCW. It says Public Participation Program but the title of the chapter reads Legislative Amendments. This may be confusing but he did not have another suggestion. Mr. Evander stated the reason for this proposal is because right now the title is Public Participation Program. If someone is going through the Code to find out how to conduct a Comprehensive Plan amendment or a zoning code amendment that includes a lot of land they will not look for public participation program. They will look for legislative amendments. Commissioner Prior asked if they might look for zoning code amendments or Comprehensive Plan amendments. Mr. Evander stated it could be called something else.

Commissioner Millman asked who would look for this. Mr. Evander stated people who administer and write the code but also people like developers who are interested in doing this. Citizens looking at the code would not be looking for public participation to find out what they need. He will find a new title. Mr. Evander stated this is not for site specific amendments. It is for larger zoning changes, Comprehensive Plan changes, and code development changes.

Chairman Mahoney referred to page 11, 17.170.040 where it states that Lewis County encourages public participation in the Growth Management process. It was Chair Mahoney's opinion that Lewis County is not the Growth Management process and that the Growth Management process is our enemy. He does not like that term. Mr. Evander asked if it could be changed to "encourages public participation." Chair Mahoney agreed with that.

Commissioner Prior stated he does not like the word "detailing" in the same clause. Perhaps "outlining" or "providing." On page 12, paragraph (1)(b) in 17.170.050 talks about the process and it states that the public must speak to what is on the agenda and they can change what is on the agenda through the amendment process. He asked if this is talking about amending the agenda. It sounds like an amendment can be made to the Planning Commission agenda so he can speak. Any time someone gets in front of the Planning Commission we are listening whether the subject is on the agenda or not. Hopefully it will be something that the Commission is talking about.

Commissioner Rosbach stated the sentence that Commissioner Prior is talking about could be struck because the next sentence says the public may submit written comments on any agenda item at any time. She thinks that means that if someone is here and wants to speak we let them speak.

Chair Mahoney asked when the meetings notices are published does the agenda have to be published in advance of the meeting. Ms. Napier stated the agenda is set in a couple of manners. One, the Chair states at the end of the meeting what is coming up. It is published on the website and sent to the posting places. Chair Mahoney asked if the agenda that is before him is published prior to the meeting. Ms. Napier stated yes. Chair Mahoney asked if the Commission has the ability to change at the last minute what is going to be discussed. Ms. Napier stated it could be brought up under Good of the Order. Chair Mahoney asked if someone came in and asked for a change without prior notice, could that be done. Otherwise why do we approve the agenda if it is set in stone? Ms. Napier suggested the Planning Commission be very cautious. Things can be added to the agenda for future meeting

discussion but to carry on a conversation that is not on the agenda.....(the rest of the statement was inaudible). Chair Mahoney stated if the Commissioners wanted to discuss the Shoreline Master Program tonight it should not have been able to do that. Ms. Napier advised against doing that.

Mr. Eisenberg stated there are Open Public Meetings Act implications. That act requires a certain amount of notice to the public of what the meeting is going to be about in order to help people get there. Many public bodies have meetings that are duly noticed and provide agenda items and things come up that were not anticipated. If they are reasonably close to what is being discussed they can be discussed as being related to the topic under discussion. When an entirely separate issue comes up then it is advisable to at least have another meeting where it is an agenda item so it can be discussed. If the Open Public Meetings Act is violated, the action that was taken is considered void. Since much of what this commission does is make recommendations to the Board that are not in themselves legally binding, that is different than when you are sitting in a judicial function. When you are in an advisory capacity to the Board he did not know how you could apply the idea that the recommendation was void because it is just information providing. Do not be embarrassed about having the members of the public discuss something that they think is relevant to the issue even if you think it is not relevant to the issue. You can express the opinion that you don't think it is relevant. If you think it is something totally different and there should be notice to other members of the public, then you should calendar a second meeting for that topic.

Chair Mahoney stated the agenda is pretty much decided by staff. Is there a mechanism by which a member of the public can state a concern that he thinks the Planning Commission should look at? Ms. Napier stated she thinks that's what the sentence in question is getting at. A new topic may be identified by the public. When the public wants to identify new topics the second sentence in (a) has the process but it is wrapped up in something else so it is very confusing. It can come through staff. For example, the setbacks. This came through Ms. Napier's office as a recurring instance where it seemed that the code didn't fit what the public was wanting. It didn't come to the Planning Commission but Ms. Napier took it to the BOCC as something that the Planning Commission should work on and asked if they agreed. They said yes so it was brought to you.

Mr. Eisenberg stated the Comprehensive Plan itself has a provision that suggests that a member of the public can propose Comp Plan amendments as well.

Commissioner Prior noted page 12, paragraph 2 (b) talks about 15 day notice. He asked why this was not 14 days. Mr. Evander stated he would check on it but he believed it is in state law. Commissioner Prior spoke to (b)(i) and said there is a Timberland Library in Packwood. In (c) it says Commerce has a 60-day review. If we are streamlining the process why does it take two months for the State review? Mr. Evander stated we have to do that and typically a draft can be sent to Commerce. When a hearing is noticed for the Planning Commission then Commerce gets a draft and 60 days would not usually be a problem. If it is something that needs to get expedited then Commerce has an expedited review that can be requested. Also, the 60-day review can be done concurrently with the SEPA public process, etc.

Commissioner Prior said in (d) there is a referral to LCC 17.05.100 (2)(c) and he thinks that is the wrong reference. Mr. Evander thought that was the section that was just deleted. Commissioner Prior stated there is a reference to 10 days and asked if that is enough time. Mr. Evander stated he would check on that.

Commissioner Rosbach referred to (2)(ii) and stated that Pe Ell also has a Senior Center.

Mr. Evander asked that the Commissioners continue to review this draft and to let him know if there is something else that should be addressed.

C. Discussion of Preliminary Outreach for Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Evander stated staff is gearing up to talk about the Comprehensive Plan and it values public input and public participation. Staff would like to go out and talk to people. There are three questions that are used often. 1 – What do you like about where you live; 2 – What would you change, and 3 – What would you like it to be like in the future. These are the things Mr. Evander would like to talk to people about. He asked if there are there other things he should be asking. Mr. Evander is thinking about going to Senior Centers, Clubs (such as Lions Club) and next Thursday he will be going to Toledo High School.

These are general questions but he wants people to have a chance to speak without framing their thoughts. Mr. Evander spoke to John Kliem and his advice was to start as wide as possible so people are not biased by anything that is being potentially presented to them. He asked if the questions should be more specific.

Commissioner Guenther stated the process with the Growth Management Act heard people stating that they wanted to maintain the rural characteristics of Lewis County. Mr. Evander thinks people will continue saying that but he also thinks there will be other ideas. He went to a high school one time and asked the students if they would live in their community after high school. Most of the students said they would be “out of here.” Knowing that, how do we transition teens out of high school to a career and a family and have them do it without leaving forever? We need to figure out how to bring jobs.

Commissioner Prior stated that any high school in the state the students are going to say exactly what the other students said. He asked how Mr. Evander proposes to get people together. Mr. Evander stated the plan is to go to groups that are already existing because inviting people to government functions does not always work. Going to Lions Clubs, etc., where people are already going is the plan. Beyond that, we want to get a sense of some of the big issues to know what we should be addressing with the Comp Plan update. We don’t want to be focusing on something that is not important to people.

Commissioner Millman asked the date to have this done. Mr. Evander stated the entire update needs to be done by June 2017 so the first phase is for initial information-gathering. This will go on over the course of the winter and hopefully next spring there will be a more fixed set of ideas that we should consider as part of the update.

Commissioner Prior asked if this update was required by Commerce. Mr. Evander stated yes, it is. Commissioner Prior asked if the County was going to hire a consultant or if the work would be done in-house.

Ms. Napier stated she still feels rather new to the community so she is trying to find opportunities to engage with different groups to encourage participation with the Planning Commission later. That is what Mr. Evander is looking into – listening posts – going out into the community. Going back to the Shoreline Master Plan outreach, staff mailed out hundreds of invitations to folks asking them to come and talk about the SMP. There were not hundreds of people in the room, so past practices tell us that

sometimes by inviting people by the traditional methods does not bring conversation to the workshops and public hearings. Something we are trying to do to assist in the work the Planning Commission will be doing is establishing listening posts, trying to find out where peoples' interests lie and also trying to engage or re-engage people in the public process.

Mr. Evander stated the second sheet on his Outreach Poster was to encourage a dialog about economic growth and job growth.

Commissioner Guenther suggested going to the Pacific Mountain Workforce Development Council to see what kind of jobs are out there and the income for Lewis County. It is way less than 70% of the State's average wage. That does not build healthy communities. Mr. Evander stated that is good advice. He used to do a data document in Thurston County, and one of the first things he did in coming to Lewis County was taking data from that document and replicated it for Lewis County. We have that data and we will use that data in the Comprehensive Plan and it makes sense to take that out to outreach meetings to frame the conversation. He does also not want the data to drive the conversation; he would like the conversation to happen and have the data to flesh it out with numbers.

Commissioner Millman stated he would be scared if a group said they wanted slow economic growth, but if someone wants increased economic growth, people are going to look at Mr. Evander for the magic bullet. What will you tell them? Mr. Evander stated he would not be telling them anything – there is no silver bullet; there is silver buckshot and many things need to be done to make it work.

Chairman Mahoney stated at one meeting there was a better-than-average income professional who did not work in the immediate community and said that he had what he wanted and he did not want anyone moving in on his road, did not want increased lights, traffic, noise. That similar attitude was found in other places. People don't want change but things have to change if their kids are going to stay in the County and have jobs. We need good paying jobs.

Mr. Evander stated that is the purpose of robust public outreach. Sometimes in a meeting like this there might be a couple of vocal minority but if there is no sense of what the larger population is thinking and there is no way to know if what they are saying is true or not. The goal is to talk to a lot of different people from a lot of different groups to get a sense of what people are thinking.

Commissioner Prior stated the largest number of people in this room was when we were talking about one parcel and a significant change to that parcel. You could approach a group by asking what they would think about something or other going in right here. Mr. Evander stated he did that when he was in Rainier and Tenino and brought up roundabouts.

Mr. Evander stated he would like the Planning Commissioners to come up with some groups of people to talk to and that information can be emailed to him. In addition to that, if anyone wants to go out and talk to people at some point, he will keep everyone informed of potential opportunities.

Chairman Mahoney thought of two groups – the Farm Bureau and Lewis County Farm Forestry. Civic groups could include Kiwanis and Rotary. Commissioner Guenther suggested the superintendents of the public schools who meet once a month. They could give a good idea of the number of students who are on free or enhanced lunches.

Chair Mahoney stated all of the high schools have civics classes. The Farm Bureau has Legislative Days in Olympia and FAA students are invited and seem to be interested in learning how things work.

Mr. Evander referred to the questions regarding the economic and job growth and stated when the discussion involves people in places not incorporated where their local government is the County, he would like to ask questions about their local area. A city government has a degree of local priorities and he would like to find out if there are things that people in unincorporated areas are thinking about that the County could help with. Perhaps there are ways to partner or leverage resources to enhance those communities.

6. Calendar

The next meeting is scheduled for November 10, 2015, a workshop on the Shoreline Master Program. Chair Mahoney asked if a public hearing needs to be set for the SMP. Ms. Napier stated the plan was to have a workshop and then decide if the Planning Commission is ready to set a public hearing for December of January.

Chair Mahoney stated the election of officers for the Planning Commission would be at the first meeting in January. Commissioners Guenther and Tausch will be done with their tenure with the Planning Commission at the end of 2015. Ms. Napier will remind the BOCC that two new members will need to be appointed.

7. Good of the Order

Mr. Eisenberg stated Mr. Evander helped write the memo on the proposed code changes for animal kennels and wanted to give credit where credit was due.

8. Adjourn

The business concluded and the meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.